



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Rabbeno, that the interval should be one of comparatively low tariff duties.

The third portion of the volume is devoted to the history of the economic theory of protection. It is made up of a criticism of Alexander Hamilton, Frederick List, Henry C. Carey and finally of Professor Patten, these being taken as typical theorists. Here our author appears at his best, and gives a keen and exhaustive analysis which well merits examination. As might be expected, Professor Patten's theory of the relation of rents to international trade is the main point of interest. And the theory that "in an exporting country free trade tends to raise the rent of land" is held "from the abstract point of view as absolutely unassailable." Unfortunately, says our author, rents appear to be rising side by side with the increase of tariff duties, and industrial protection cannot long endure unless the farmers are indemnified by an increase of duties on their products,—a truth, be it observed, which the recent M^éline tariff of France amply illustrates.

Despite most destructive criticism, our author admits that the theories of Professor Patten really correspond to two great features of American civilization: first, the enormous extent and variety of our land area, demanding a new conception of consumption if we are to utilize its vast resources; and second, an unconscious foreboding of the impending doom of manufacturing industry in face of the persistent fall in profits and the rise of rents. Protection, he says, marks a struggle between the landowner and the *entrepreneur*; and there will be no settlement of the difficulty under the present system of landowning and production.

The famous statement with regard to the arithmetic of the customs which the author quotes from Professor Ely, should be credited to Dean Swift.

WILLIAM Z. RIPLEY.

INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
BOSTON, MASS.

The Mark in England and America. A Review of the Discussion on Early Land Tenure. By ENOCH A. BRYAN, A.M. Boston, Ginn & Co., 1893.—viii, 164 pp.

It is not quite clear for whom Mr. Bryan has intended his brief sketch of the mark controversy. He certainly would not presume, in view of the limited study he has given to the matter, to speak to specialists, and his style, manner of treatment and knowledge of the relative importance of the various parts of his subject to each other

and to present politics, make the book an unsafe guide for beginners. The economic side of the question has now become so important historically, that a good preliminary sketch of the subject would be extremely useful and, it is to be hoped, will be some day forthcoming. The difficulty with Mr. Bryan's book is that it gives an entirely false impression of the present state of some phases of the controversy, and he treats the pro-markists in so disagreeable a manner as to bespeak the partisan. A word of explanation will illustrate my meaning.

The student who gets his first knowledge of the mark theory from this work will infer that M. Fustel de Coulanges and Mr. Seebohm are absolutely and unqualifiedly right, and that no scholar of any importance or any respect for his historical reputation would still presume to hold other views than theirs. It might surprise such a reader to learn that these views, which in Mr. Bryan's book exclude all else, are after all simply inferences drawn from debatable evidence. He certainly would not be led to infer that some modified form of the mark theory has at the present time a much better prospect of life than the conclusions of those who reject it entirely; nor would he conjecture that so late as the year of our Lord eighteen hundred and ninety-three so thorough a scholar as Professor Vinogradoff can still state it as his belief that between the tribal and the manorial system there existed a distinct transitional form, which was distinguished from the tribe by its territorial basis, from the manor by the freedom of its members, and from both by the extent of its self-government. What I want to say is, that in a review of the discussion these opinions should have been given an honorable place, and should not have been brushed aside as if they were the opinions of ignorant and misguided men. Mr. Bryan's year of study hardly qualifies him for the position of critic.

It is not necessary to enter into a detailed examination of the book; it offers nothing new except the criticisms upon the mark in America and the mark in economic discussion. As to the first of these points, the theories there controverted have long since gone by default and it hardly seems necessary to revive them; as to the second point, Mr. Bryan has a very exaggerated idea of the importance of the mark theory in practical economics and present politics.

One matter I should like to discuss briefly, as its importance extends much beyond Mr. Bryan's book. It is the prominence given to what is called the "curve" of social evolution (pp. 75, 106-108). When once the idea of such a mathematically accurate curve, "sweeping backward through the slowly changing system of culti-

vation to its beginnings," takes possession of the mind, it is difficult to avoid the manipulation of historical facts in its favor, instead of conforming the direction of social advance to the facts. It is possible to modify one of Mr. Bryan's own statements as an argument against him and to say that "if one approaches the evidence with this *direction* in his mind, he is apt to find the *direction* in the evidence" (page 22). Throughout the whole of the second and third chapters Mr. Bryan is mastered by this positivist idea, and he seems to be a follower of Condorcet and Comte without knowing it; for his line of progress is destined to lead to human perfectibility if long enough persisted in. Mr. Bryan does not see that it is possible for just as true a social evolution to take place under a theory other than that which he has adopted. He does not see that while the apparent direction of social evolution is represented by a broken line which sometimes rises and sometimes falls, the real direction is continuously forward. It is impossible for the apparent advance of social progress to be one of unchanging improvement. Economic history is showing that society, through the introduction of new economic factors at certain stages in its history, has passed through periods and crises in which the condition of the mass of the people was worse than before. The transition from tribal to political life, with land as the new economic factor; from self-sufficient to profit-gaining economy; from the open-field system to enclosures and rotation of crops; from hand-labor to machinery,—was in each case a crisis and led to the deflection of the apparent line of progress and to disastrous consequences for masses of the population. Yet no one will say that the real direction was not toward a better social order and a truer freedom.

These considerations seem to me to reveal the underlying fallacy in Mr. Bryan's reasoning. That the facts are against him is clear enough. Professor Vinogradoff shows plainly that thirteenth century conditions were worse than those of the eleventh century. Every one knows that thousands of artisans were discharged as machinery was introduced into manufactures, and that the distress of the wage-earners in the beginning of this century was greater than in the century before. I affirm that the same was true of the transition from tribal to political life: the apparent change as seen in manorial serfdom was for the worse; the real change, the passing to a higher form of social and political order, was for the better.